

Cp352.01
B37A

Democratic Rule in Beaufort Co.

THE LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF
NORTH CAROLINA



THE COLLECTION OF
NORTH CAROLINIANA

Cp352.01
B37r

DEMOCRATIC RULE
IN
BEAUFORT COUNTY

From 1898 to 1908

INTRODUCTORY.

The facts and figures contained in this pamphlet are taken from the records of Beaufort County, and you are cordially invited to compare them.

Cp 352.01

B372

BEAUFORT COUNTY.

During the White Supremacy Campaign we were told by the Democratic speakers, such as Aycok, Simmons and men of their ability, that if the Constitutional Amendment was enacted into law there would be no longer need of ballot box stuffing; that party strife and political hatred would disappear; that all issues would be settled at the polls in a rational and honest manner, for it would be between white man and white man, and that the State would blossom as a rose. The Democratic speakers throughout the State took up the refrain and the campaign for the white man was waged as never was a campaign in North Carolina before. The white man, with his superior right to rule, wrote with his ballot the verdict of his race. We do not question this verdict, for it was the white Republican who made this verdict possible.

Ten years have elapsed since that time, and if the prediction of the matchless speakers and the prophecies of the Democratic papers are ever to be fulfilled, we think it time. The prediction that the fight at the polls shall be white man against white man is an assured fact, but what as to the remainder of the prophecy? Has party strife and political hatred disappeared? We think not, and would call your attention to the methods of the Democrats conducting the present campaign. Read the screed in the *News and Observer* a few days ago in which the "red shirt" is flaunted, and the dead and buried ghost of negro domination resurrected and placed upon exhibition for the purpose of threatening the timid voter. Has the State blossomed as the rose? If creating more

1902

offices, increasing salaries, collecting more taxes and ruthless extravagance is to be taken for progress, verily that part of the prediction has also come to pass.

The motive of this pamphlet is to place before you a few facts concerning the increase in salaries of the officers of Beaufort County, and the wanton manner in which the public moneys have been squandered, to show the voters why the debt of this county has risen from about \$22,000 in 1898 to the enormous sum of \$69,000 at the present time, notwithstanding the fact that the amount of taxes collected has steadily increased from that date until the present time, when there is over double the taxes levied that were in 1898. We submit a table showing the indebtedness of the county for the several years, as follows:

TABLE No. 1.

Outstanding Indebtedness.

Date.	Date of Finance Com. Report.	
1898.	December 5, 1898, including jail and vault,	\$22,843.21
1899.	June 30, 1899.....	21,976.87
1900.	June 30, 1900.....	19,906.58
1901.	June 30, 1901.....	20,830.77
1902.	June 30, 1902.....	19,944.05
1903.	June 30, 1903.....	18,133.50
1904.	June 30, 1904.....	17,840.00
1905.	June 30, 1905.....	14,392.00
1906.	June 30, 1906.....	14,900.00
1907.	June 30, 1907.....	12,500.00
1908.	June 30, 1908.....	\$14,500.00
	Borrowed from bank since report....	6,500.00
	Contracts outstanding and unpaid....	48,577.00
		69,577.00

From the above table you will see the variations of the public debt each year during the nine years of Democratic rule. When the Republicans retired from office December 5th, 1898, the incoming Board of Commissioners appointed a finance committee to in-

investigate the financial condition of the county. The figures used herein are taken from the reports of that and subsequent Democratic finance committees on file in the office of the Register of Deeds of Beaufort County. We invite you to compare the figures for these periods. In 1898 the Republicans, on retiring from office, left a public debt of \$22,843.21, which included the unpaid balance on the vaults and jail. The Democrats have gradually increased the taxes by increasing the valuation of property, as will be shown you further on, but have not decreased the indebtedness during any of these years in the same proportion, and with the public debt on August 1st, 1908, of \$69,577, have shown their ability to squander money. As evidence of this fact we submit the following tables showing the valuation of property and the amount of taxes levied the last year of Republican rule and of each succeeding year since that time under Democratic rule:

TABLE No. 2.

Date.	Property Valuation.	School Tax.	Unlisted School Tax.	State Aid for Schools.	General County.	Special County.	Unlisted County.	Total.
898	\$2,687,395	\$9,665.77	\$2,447.01	-----	\$8,683.41	\$5,203.16	\$1,545.11	\$27,544.46
899	3,155,391	12,553.70	2,129.55	-----	9,811.44	6,271.11	2,129.55	-----
900	3,002,576	11,821.52	1,167.04	-----	9,328.11	5,945.66	1,562.45	-----
901	3,266,482	12,740.67	928.22	-----	10,186.89	6,505.63	1,419.01	-----
902	3,504,683	13,403.57	2,304.85	-----	10,857.96	6,895.58	2,363.59	-----
903	4,593,793	16,018.37	1,375.00	\$2,635.20	13,929.92	8,800.53	1,625.48	-----
904	4,601,205	16,025.45	1,000.00	1,244.46	14,325.66	8,734.23	2,867.06	-----
905	4,631,857	16,405.38	925.00	1,365.29	14,403.37	8,952.62	2,770.72	-----
906	4,858,262	16,871.07	850.00	1,289.88	14,955.24	12,213.20	1,984.60	-----
907	6,245,207	19,877.38	1,650.00	1,283.14	18,863.42	11,476.35	1,225.20	54,375.49

These figures are taken from the abstract of listed and unlisted taxes as reported by the Register of Deeds of your county to the State Auditor. Voter,

look carefully at this table. In 1898 the Republicans levied for all purposes \$27,544.46. Nine years later the Democrats levied for all purposes the sum of \$54,375.49, practically double the amount levied by the Republicans. If you ask one of these gentlemen about this he will say that taxes are no higher to-day than they were in 1898. In that he is right, but look in the column marked "Property Valuation," and notice the value of property in 1898 was \$2,687,595, in 1907, \$6,245,207, and you have the answer as to where the enormous amount in the increase of taxes comes in. In order to procure more money from the people by way of taxes, the valuation has steadily risen to meet the ever-increasing demand for more money caused by their extravagance. Just here it would be well to consider: if the Republicans could run the county with \$25,544.46 and only owe a public debt of \$22,843.21, is it not extravagance pure and simple for the Democrats to levy \$54,375.49 and owe a debt of \$69,577? Consider this. For fear that some one may not properly understand the tax levies we have divided the county funds from the public school funds and show you each as follows:

TABLE No. 3.**School Fund.**

Date.	Gen. Sch. Tax.	Unlisted Tax.	State Aid.	Total.
1898	\$9,665.77	\$2,447.01	\$12,112.78
1899	12,553.70	2,129.55	14,683.25
1900	11,821.52	1,167.04	12,988.56
1901	12,740.67	928.22	13,668.89
1902	13,403.57	2,304.85	15,708.42
1903	16,018.37	1,375.00	\$2,635.20	26,028.57
1904	16,025.45	1,000.00	1,344.46	18,269.91
1905	16,405.38	925.00	1,365.29	18,965.67
1906	16,871.07	850.00	1,289.88	19,010.95
1907	19,877.38	1,650.00	1,283.14	22,810.52

TABLE No. 4.
General County Tax Levy.

Year.	Gen. County.	Spec. County.	Unlisted.	Total.
1898	\$8,643.41	\$5,203.16	\$1,545.11	\$15,431.68
1899	9,811.44	6,271.11	2,129.55	18,212.10
1900	9,328.11	5,945.66	1,562.45	16,836.22
1901	10,186.89	6,505.63	1,419.01	18,111.53
1902	10,857.96	6,895.58	2,158.35	19,911.89
1903	13,929.92	8,800.53	2,182.69	24,913.14
1904	14,325.66	8,734.23	2,867.06	25,926.95
1905	14,403.37	8,952.62	2,770.72	26,126.71
1906	14,955.24	12,213.20	1,904.60	29,073.04
1907	18,863.42	11,476.35	1,225.20	31,564.97

It will be well since showing the increase in taxes to show the expenditure of the same:

TABLE No. 5.
Expenditure.

June 30, 1897, to June 30, 1898.....	\$10,101.42
June 30, 1898, to June 30, 1899.....	11,154.32
June 30, 1899, to June 30, 1900.....	11,777.46
June 30, 1900, to June 30, 1901.....	15,045.06
June 30, 1901, to June 30, 1902.....	17,666.56
June 30, 1902, to June 30, 1903.....	14,426.93
June 30, 1903, to June 30, 1904.....	18,928.24
June 30, 1904, to June 30, 1905.....	21,366.35
June 30, 1905, to June 30, 1906.....	26,603.79
June 30, 1906, to June 30, 1907.....	27,298.15
June 30, 1907, to June 30, 1908.....	\$37,211.35
Other contracts outstanding for which no warrant is issued.....	48,577.00
	85,788.35

SCHOOLS.

The figures contained in Table No. 3 do not embrace the extra taxes collected in Washington, Belhaven, Aurora, Small's School District or any other special taxes for school purposes, but refers to the general tax levy of the county for school purposes, and does not include the fines and penalties received from Justices of the peace and others. Table No.

3 shows you that the Republicans only levied \$12,-112.78 for schools during 1898. That has been but a few years ago, and you can remember the length of the school term in your district. You do remember. The Republicans furnished you that school for \$12,-112.78 and paid the cost of all the officers connected with the system, including the salaries of teachers. Look at the table above and you will see that the Democrats have taxed you for your part of the \$22,-810.52 levied by them. Look again and you will see that \$1,283.14 of this \$22,810.52 was received from the State Board of Education. To procure this amount the school board had to make oath that the funds levied by the county were not sufficient to give the children four months' school. This amount was donated by the State to make a four months' term. Then compare the term given you by the Republicans and the cost of the same with the four months given you by the Democrats and the cost of the same. I leave you to decide which of the two administrations is the more economical.

But some one will say that the cost of living is higher than when under Republican rule. I grant you that but ask you this question. Did the Democrats, with double the amount of money, double the school term or double the salary of the teachers? No. The records show it. Then we assert that the Republican administration was more judiciously administered than the Democratic administration.

GENERAL COUNTY TAX.

Tables Nos. 4, 5 and 1 show that in 1898 the Republicans levied for general county purposes \$15,-431.68, spent for running expenses \$10,101.42, and went out of office with a public debt of \$22,843.21;

that the Democrats in 1907 levied \$31,564.98, expended \$85,788.35, and owed, August 1st, 1908, \$69,577. The comparison is worth your careful consideration. The Democrats received the county government from the Republicans with a public debt of \$22,843.21, with a running expense of \$10,000. During nine years the Democrats have levied and spent \$216,074.55 in general county taxes and have increased the public debt \$46,733.79, making a total cost to the taxpayers of \$262,808.34 in the nine years, or an average of \$29,200 per year. Compare this, if you please, with the \$10,000 running expenses when the Republicans retired from office. Some one will inquire how this money was spent. That is another story and will require a large space in the telling, but we will give you a few illustrations of how it separated itself from the public treasury.

EXTRAVAGANCE.

When the Republicans were administering the affairs of the county, the Board consisted of three members, who received \$2 per diem and mileage for services. The per diem and mileage of this Board from June 30th, 1897, to December 5th, 1898, about one and a half years, amounted to \$437.25, as shown by the report of the Democratic Finance Committee appointed to investigate the condition of the county at the time the Democrats assumed control of the same. We find upon the record that in 1902 the Board was increased from three to five members to make additional offices for hungry Democrats. Not satisfied with this extra expense on the county, we see upon the record that "Extra pay and allowance" was allowed members of the Board for services, either imaginary or real, increasing still more the expense

of Democratic rule. Finding that the taxpayers of the county submitted to this with little or no complaint, and feeling secure in the large majority for their party in this county, they proceeded to administer larger doses of Democracy to the taxpayers and created places for two more of their "faithful" by increasing the members of the Board from five to seven; to raise their pay from \$2 per diem and mileage to \$2.50 per diem and mileage, and to place the chairman on a salary of \$200 per annum. Does it not appear to you that this should have satisfied the "faithful" who held these offices? But it did not. We still see extra allowances to members and a Christmas present of \$25 each handed over to each member out of the public money collected from the taxpayers of this county.

The comparison of the annual cost of each Board is contained in the following tables:

TABLE No. 6.

December 1, 1898, to December 1, 1899.

Name, and For What Paid.	Amount.
Thomas H. Blount, per diem and mileage.....	\$59.30
Thomas H. Blount, extra pay.....	50.00
C. P. Aycock, per diem and mileage.....	87.10
F. H. Van Eberstein, per diem and mileage.....	64.50
W. B. Rodman, attorney, salary.....	150.00
Total.....	\$410.90

TABLE No. 7.

December 1, 1899, to December 1, 1900.

Name, and For What Paid.	Amount.
Thomas H. Blount, per diem and mileage.....	\$53.40
Thomas H. Blount, extra pay.....	64.00
C. P. Aycock, per diem and mileage.....	83.10
F. H. Von Eberstein, per diem and mileage.....	59.00
W. B. Rodman, attorney, salary.....	150.00
Total.....	\$409.50

TABLE No. 8.

December 1, 1900, to December 1, 1901.

Name, and For What Paid.	Amount.
Thomas H. Blount, per diem and mileage.....	\$59.30
Thomas H. Blount, extra pay.....	71.00
G. L. Swindell, per diem and mileage.....	89.60
B. H. Thompson, per diem and mileage.....	79.50
W. B. Rodman, attorney, salary.....	150.00
W. B. Rodman, extra pay.....	70.00
Total.....	<u>\$519.40</u>

TABLE No. 9.

December 1, 1901, to December 1, 1902.

Name, and For What Paid.	Amount.
Thomas H. Blount, per diem and mileage.....	\$55.40
Thomas H. Blount, extra pay.....	105.00
G. L. Swindell, per diem and mileage.....	96.80
G. L. Swindell, extra pay.....	8.00
B. H. Thompson, per diem and mileage.....	108.50
W. B. Rodman, attorney, salary.....	150.00
W. B. Rodman, extra pay.....	10.00
Total.....	<u>\$533.70</u>

TABLE No. 10.

December 1, 1902, to December 1, 1903.

Name, and For What Paid.	Amount.
O. K. Stilley, per diem and mileage.....	\$91.00
O. K. Stilley, extra pay.....	83.00
T. H. Blount, per diem and mileage.....	53.00
T. H. Blount, extra pay.....	40.00
W. T. Hooton, per diem and mileage.....	63.50
W. T. Hooton, extra pay.....	134.00
H. G. Jordan, per diem and mileage.....	76.00
T. M. Midgett, per diem and mileage.....	66.90
W. B. Rodman, attorney, salary.....	150.00
W. B. Rodman, extra pay.....	15.00
Total.....	<u>\$772.40</u>

TABLE No. 11.**December 1, 1903, to December 1, 1904.**

Name, and For What Paid.	Amount.
O. K. Stilley, per diem and mileage.....	\$87.00
O. K. Stilley, extra pay.....	104.00
H. G. Jordan, per diem and mileage.....	70.00
T. M. Midgett, per diem and mileage.....	60.80
T. H. Blount, per diem and mileage.....	53.50
T. H. Blount, extra pay.....	36.00
W. T. Hooton, per diem and mileage.....	56.20
W. T. Hooton, extra pay.....	24.00
W. B. Rodman, attorney, salary.....	150.00
W. B. Rodman, extra pay.....	25.00
Total.....	\$666.50

TABLE No. 12.**December 1, 1904, to December 1, 1905.**

Name, and For What Paid.	Amount.
Thomas H. Blount, per diem and mileage.....	\$59.40
Thomas H. Blount, extra pay.....	140.00
G. L. Swindell, per diem and mileage.....	102.80
G. L. Swindell, extra pay.....	25.00
Fred Wolfenden, per diem and mileage.....	62.20
Fred Wolfenden, extra pay.....	49.00
H. G. Jordan, per diem and mileage.....	74.80
H. G. Jordan, extra pay.....	67.00
B. D. Rowe, per diem and mileage.....	95.00
B. D. Rowe, extra pay.....	39.00
W. C. Rodman, attorney, salary.....	150.00
W. C. Rodman, extra pay.....	85.00
Total.....	\$949.20

TABLE No. 13.**December 1, 1905, to December 1, 1906.**

Name, and For What Paid.	Amount.
Thomas H. Blount, per diem and mileage.....	\$63.60
Thomas H. Blount, extra pay.....	140.00
G. L. Swindell, per diem and mileage.....	109.20
G. L. Swindell, extra pay.....	20.00
B. D. Rowe, per diem and mileage.....	99.50
B. D. Rowe, extra pay.....	18.00
Fred Wolfenden, per diem and mileage.....	64.80
Fred Wolfenden, extra pay.....	15.00

H. G. Jordan, per diem and mileage.....	77.20
H. G. Jordan, extra pay.....	30.00
W. C. Rodman, attorney, salary.....	150.00
W. C. Rodman, extra pay.....	20.00
Total.....	<u>\$807.30</u>

TABLE No. 14.

December 1, 1906, to December 1, 1907.

Name, and For What Paid.	Amount.
R. R. Warner, per diem and mileage.....	\$153.06
H. G. Jordan, per diem and mileage.....	84.00
H. G. Jordan, extra pay.....	9.00
Fred Wolfenden, per diem and mileage.....	74.50
Fred Wolfenden, extra pay.....	15.00
Thomas Greene, per diem and mileage.....	103.95
John C. Oden, per diem and mileage.....	89.50
W. A. Thompson, per diem and mileage.....	105.00
W. A. Thompson, extra pay.....	5.75
W. H. Stancill, per diem and mileage.....	75.80
W. H. Stancill, extra pay.....	14.00
H. C. Carter, attorney, salary.....	150.00
H. C. Carter, extra pay.....	112.00
Total.....	<u>\$992.06</u>

(The Keeper of the Poor was not forgotten in this donation of public money; each year he is paid an extra allowance.) The Superintendent of Health considered himself a very unfortunate individual in receiving only \$200 per year, and on account of the extremely arduous duties of his office thinks he should be paid an extra allowance for vaccinating people when the smallpox appeared. In fact, the County Commissioners are easy marks for many of the "faithful." They deemed it necessary to pay for vaccinating all the people any of the doctors could lay their hands upon, and nearly \$1,000 was fooled away in this way. If it was law that people should be vaccinated, why did they not go to the doctor and get it done? Why were the taxpayers to assume this burden? It is as reasonable to provide all the people

with medical aid for all purposes as for the purpose of vaccination. In this connection it would be well to say that some more of your money went by way of promoting the Fowle Memorial Hospital. For a considerable time this institution received \$50 per month for the purpose of assisting a worthy cause. The records show that while this was being given the hospital, the county had to pay extra for patients sent there for treatment. A hospital is a good institution, but we fail to see why the public money should be used for promoting private interests.

Every person who has had the misfortune to be defeated in a lawsuit in court will remember that the bill of cost paid the clerk contained a fee for docketing, recording, filing, and for every conceivable thing the imagination of man could think of or the genius of the Devil could suggest, but still the clerk of the court was never satisfied. Why should he be? Were not others getting an extra loaf? Why overlook him? So he goes on drawing from \$25 to \$63 per term for making up the dockets for the Superior Court, when the fees for this work were being collected out of the litigants

The Commissioners, finding that the attorneys have some little trouble in searching the old records, employed another of the "faithful" at three cents per instrument to transcribe the index. It would have been better, had this work been necessary, to have employed a good man at a reasonable salary and had the work done at half the cost.

(The most uncalled-for expenditure that every taxpayer of the county should resent is the donation of \$250 per year to a little band of "soldiers," called the "Washington Light Infantry." What earthly good is this expense? This company has its uniform,

guns and ammunition furnished them by the United States, and when called out for duty or sent to annual encampment, their traveling expenses and service pay is given them by the United States, or the State of North Carolina; so why should this county invest \$250 per year in this outfit?)

INCOMPETENCY.

To say that the men who have been handling the county's finances are corrupt would be impeaching the character of some very good citizens, and we shall not go to that extent, but we will say that they were incompetent and grossly negligent of their duties. This is a broad assertion, but a view of the facts, we think, will bear out the assertion.

The records show that in changing the Washington bridge, as contemplated in the new contract, it touched a small piece of land belonging to the Rodman heirs, worth perhaps \$10. We find the present Board starting out with great gusto and authorizing its attorney to institute condemnation proceedings. This occurred June 2, 1908, but we find at the next meeting of the Board, on July 7th, without having any report or any action on the part of the county attorney, the Board passed an order to pay the Rodman heirs \$500 for this piece of land. This action was so flagrant an act of injustice on the part of the Commissioners that two of the Democratic Board saw fit to oppose the passage of this order.

The law requires that accounts for material, services or supplies furnished the county shall be upon the sworn account of the party furnishing same, who shall make oath that the items charged therein have been delivered, the services performed and the prices charged are just and reasonable, and that no part of

the same has been paid. In the face of this law, in May, 1908, the County Commissioners instituted a system of paying out county money unbusiness-like and calculated to work considerable hardship and ruin to the county by allowing each Commissioner to purchase whatever supplies he deemed advisable and draw upon the sheriff an order for same. The sheriff, in collecting his money for these accounts, never specifies what the orders are for, but simply charges an order in the name of the Commissioner drawing the same and receives his pay accordingly. This policy lays the foundation for a system of graft that no finance committee in the world could detect, and is a violation of the law as above recited.

The management of the chain gang is left solely to the will of the Chairman of the Commissioners and appears to be run on very loose business principles. Another very glaring proof of the incompetency of this Board is the fact that prisoners who are unable to give bond are allowed to remain in jail for months at the time awaiting the action of the Superior Court. In a county the size of Beaufort it necessarily follows that a considerable number of prisoners are in jail. If due effort had been made a Criminal Court could have been established for this county, by which these prisoners could have been tried and disposed of in such manner that their labor would have paid their expense.

The greatest evidence of the lack of business tact and judicious management is shown in the attempt to dispose of \$50,000 in bonds. We find that these securities were sold to one firm upon a contract so vague that when the deal was to be made the contract could not be interpreted to the satisfaction of both parties, resulting in a rupture of the negotiations.

Next, we find the Commissioners making an order that these bonds in the sum of \$50,000 be turned over to one R. S. Neal, holding a contract for the Washington bridge, for which the county agreed to pay \$28,000, leaving him the opportunity to hold and dispose of \$22,000 of the county paper without security or without authority to handle the same.

Further evidence of incompetency and party prejudice is shown in the following facts: L. G. Caton, a Republican, owning 82 acres of land that cost \$1 per acre with no improvements, was assessed at \$7 per acre for the same, while W. B. Redditt and L. H. Ross, Democrats, owning part of the same tract of land, were assessed at \$4 per acre. C. A. Caton, a Republican, owning 18 acres of land, was assessed at \$15.30 per acre, while W. B. Redditt, Democrat, owning 324 acres of the same tract, was assessed at \$2.78 per acre. C. A. Caton, Republican, owned five acres of land upon which improvements have been placed to the amount of \$100, was assessed at \$40 per acre, while L. H. Ross, Democrat, owning the adjoining land, was assessed at \$4 per acre. C. A. Tooten, Democrat, owning part of the same tract of land with L. G. Caton referred to, was assessed at \$2.50 per acre. B. W. and B. D. Caton, Republicans, owned land adjoining W. B. Redditt, whose land was assessed at \$2.78 per acre, while theirs was assessed at \$14 per acre. Another instance of this unjust discrimination is shown in the valuation of 16 acres of land belonging to Geo. Lee, valued at \$50 per acre, while D. B. Mixon, Democrat, who owns ten acres adjoining with improvements equal to if not exceeding that of Lee, is valued at \$20 per acre. This is a very significant illustration, as the lands in question are only separated by the public road.

It will be seen from the record on September 3, 1907, the Board of Commissioners entered into the special confidence of R. S. Neal and contracted with him to build a bridge across Pamlico River for the sum of \$28,000; and this contract was entered into by the Commissioners without any competitive bidding for the work, and without any plans and specifications being furnished the Commissioners by the said Neal prior to fixing the amount of compensation, to wit, \$28,000. It will be seen that on June 2, 1908, somebody's conscience had been touching him and the county attorney, together with a civil engineer, were authorized by the Board of Commissioners to draw up specifications for plans for the bridge to fit the set price of \$28,000. This is a rather unprecedented development in architecture. Usually the contractor presents plans and specifications and bids in accordance therewith, but in this instance it seems that the Commissioners notified the contractor that they were going to spend \$28,000, and asked him to build as nice a bridge as he conveniently could afford to build for that price, at the same time saying that there was no competition in the matter. With this leverage it is safe to say that the contractor did not lose any money, and if he did he ought to be tapped for the simples. And this same kind of high finance made itself apparent also in the case of M. M. Jones, who got the contract to build a bridge at Pantego, he furnishing his own specifications for the job after the contract had been awarded to him. It would seem that the Commissioners of Beaufort County have improved somewhat on the delectable grafters that engineered the State Building in the city of Harrisburg in the State of Pennsylvania, and yet the people are requested to kindly cast their votes in the coming elec-

tion to perpetuate in power the heirs and assigns of these men and of the Democratic party.

BRIDGE.

This same Board of Commissioners have fixed upon the taxpayers of Beaufort County a debt of \$50,000, purposing to issue bonds in the said sum carrying 5 per cent interest, covering a period of thirty years, in payment for the above work of constructing bridges in Beaufort County, and yet the voters of that county with blind confidence are asked to perpetuate the heirs and assigns of the Democratic party in office. The interest on this indebtedness is \$2,500 per year for thirty years, making a total interest of \$75,000, plus the original bond issue of \$50,000, which makes a sum total of \$125,000 that the voters are called upon to fix upon themselves. In addition to this expenditure will be added the cost by way of commission to the Sheriff and the Treasurer of Beaufort County the sum of \$200 per annum, which makes \$6,000 more, and swells the grand total to \$131,000 for an original investment of \$50,000.

PROHIBITION.

The recent Democratic Legislature of North Carolina made a vicious and cowardly attack on the railroads of this State in that it tried to fix the passenger rate at two cents per mile, and absolutely ignored the freight rates, a much more vital question to the people of the State. The railroads rebelled at this piece of high-handed usurpation, alleging that the Legislature had neither the special knowledge nor the proper spirit in fixing the rate of compensation upon the railroads. The railroads took their case to the Supreme Court of the United States, which declared

such action unconstitutional. But, said the Democrats, that was a Radical court and nothing better was to be expected. Lo, and behold! the Democratic Supreme Court of North Carolina also declared the act unconstitutional when it failed to sustain the case of *State v. Green*, adjudicated by his Honor, Judge Long. Then the bottom fell out in that a Democratic court had declared against State Rights and left the Democratic party in the middle of the hole. Then it was that Gov. Glenn called an extra session of the Legislature ostensibly to fill up this hole, and in order to divert the attention of the people of the State from the miserable blunder that it had committed launched upon the State, when no man was expecting it and no man demanding it, a State Prohibition Bill which succeeded for a time in serving the behests for which it was called forth. This State Prohibition Bill was the special child of the Democratic party and nobody else was directly responsible for this act of high-handed legislation save only the Democratic party. But it may be pointed out that certain prominent Republicans favored State prohibition. Very well, in 1900 the Democratic party brought forward the Constitutional Amendment which upon its ratification eliminated the negro vote in the State, thereby relieving the Republican party of a serious incubus in matters of political issue. In 1908 by means of this State prohibition bill the Democratic party relieved itself of its main asset, to wit, the rum sellers. It is a matter of common knowledge that nine out of ten rum sellers in North Carolina were Democrats. They had to be in order to escape punishment at the hands of Democratic courts and legislatures. Each rum seller in North Carolina controlled a floating vote of at least twenty-five men who were furnished with

tickets the night before the election, and could be as certainly counted upon to deposit these tickets as delivered as could the negroes be counted upon to vote in solid phalanxes the Republican ticket. The Democratic party did this in the face of the fact that in 1898 and 1900 the barrooms of the State were the places where special caucuses were held and ways and means devised by which rifles were placed in the hands of citizens and by which red shirts adorned persons. Certain Republican leaders in the State, alive to the fact that State prohibition was a great moral question first, and still further alive to the fact that the bill as brought forward would play the devil with the Democratic party, did their best to bring about the ratification of the said bill. The sequel tells the story. The Democratic party is split from A to Z in this State because of this unfair treatment in disregarding the time-honored custom of local self-government in that it allowed Buncombe County, with a 4,000 prohibition majority, to say that no whiskey should be sold in Martin County which had an overwhelming anti-prohibition majority. The lesson is so plain that he who runs may read.

We pledge the people of Beaufort County that if they entrust us with the power, as we confidently believe they will do and as we know they ought to do in view of the above facts, as follows:

1. To administer the affairs of the county on the basis of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, to the end that the "people shall rule."

2. To lower the present burdensome tax rate in Beaufort County.

3. To equalize the valuation of property based upon its true value so that the burden of taxation may fall

equally upon the taxpayer according to his possessions.

4. To improve the present slack-twisted management of the public schools of the said county and give it an up-to-date and honest free school administration.

5. To reduce the Board of County Commissioners from seven to three members, the original number; and we pledge that no Christmas presents will be made through fear or favor, reward or hope of reward.

6. To restore local self-government in Beaufort County.

7. To create a criminal court that shall have jurisdiction over all offenses not punishable upon conviction by more than one year in the penitentiary.



UNIVERSITY OF N.C. AT CHAPEL HILL



00042065905

FOR USE ONLY IN
THE NORTH CAROLINA COLLECTION

